

Application No. 09/723,123  
Amendment dated November 03, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2003

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 double patenting over claims 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26 and 29 of copending Application No. 09/390,255 in view of Ogata et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,777,678 (hereinafter, "Ogata"). Claims 1-15 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zandi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,941, hereinafter, "Zandi") in view of Ogata. By this amendment, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are amended without adding any new matter while claim 8 is amended as to matter of form.

Claim 1 recites a method in which for each bit order, coding the associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order. Specifically, the method of claim 1 calls for in a single pass, embedding zerotree coding of wavelet transformed error image while encoding insignificant wavelet coefficients in the course of initial passes. Support for this limitation may be found in Applicant's specification on page 16, lines 4-9 and on page 23, lines 8-11. However, the cited references fail to teach or suggest claim 1 limitations as a whole, in turn, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is absent for independent claim 1.

Ogata fails to teach or suggest embedding zerotree coding of wavelet transformed error image in a single pass while encoding insignificant wavelet coefficients in the course of initial passes. In fact, Ogata merely teaches error motion coding using wavelet transform in which a wavelet transform unit shows two-state band splitting by performing two vertical high-pass filtering operations. See column 8, lines 23-25 and column 11, lines 54-56. Nowhere is single pass embedding zerotree coding of wavelet transformed error image is taught or otherwise suggested.

Zandi likewise neither teaches nor suggests for each bit order, coding associated bits to indicate zerotree roots that are associated with the bit order. Therefore, even if combined, the cited references fail to render now amended claim 1 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the § 101 and § 103 rejections of claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom. In this manner, independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, which is requested of the Examiner along with allowance of the corresponding dependent claims.

Application No. 09/723,123  
Amendment dated November 03, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of October 10, 2003

More specifically, the limitation in claim 1, compared to either alone or in combination with the Zandi and Ogata references in which classical EZT technique is used, avoids passing over the smaller or insignificant coefficients in every pass by encoding them in course of the initial passes. The two passes of the classical EZT scheme are also now clubbed into a single pass, offering a relatively improved computational technique for compression. None of these features are taught or even remotely suggested by the Zandi reference or the Ogata reference either considered separately or together. For this reason alone, the method of claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

Based on the same reasons as presented in the context of the claim 1, independent claim 7, which is an article claim and independent claim 13, which is a system claim are also deemed to be patentable. Accordingly, the article of claim 7, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Thus, all the claims that depend from allowable independent claim 7 are in condition for allowance as well. The system of claim 13 also includes a similar limitation, rendering it in condition for allowance because it patentably distinguishes over the cited references. Neither the Zandi reference nor the Ogata reference teach or suggest the system of claim 13. In this manner, the system of claim 13 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider all pending claims.

In view of these amendments and remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 03, 2003

---

Sanjeev K. Singh under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b)  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906